

REMARKS

I. General

Claims 26, 27, and 29-47 are currently pending, and all are rejected by the Office Action mailed November 16, 2006. No claims are amended by this response. The issues in the Office Action are as follows:

- Claims 26, 27, 29, and 32-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over US 5,845,303 (hereinafter, *Templeman*) in view of US 5,897,644 (hereinafter, *Nielsen*) in further view of Mosaic Quick Tour for Mac (hereinafter, *Mosaic*).
- Claims 30, 31, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Templeman* in view of *Nielsen* in further view of *Mosaic* in further view of US 6,161,114 (hereinafter, *King*).

Applicant hereby addresses the rejections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal in light of the remarks and amendments contained herein.

II. Applicant's Record Under M.P.E.P. § 713.04 of Interview with the Examiner

Applicant's attorney appreciates the Examiners' time and consideration in conducting the telephone interview of February 1, 2007. Applicant respectfully submits the following record of the telephone interview under M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

The following persons participated in the interview: Examiner William Bushore and Applicant's Attorney Thomas Meaney (reg# 41,990).

The claims were discussed with reference made to the cited art. Applicant noted that the rejection does not comply with the (Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences) BPAI's appeal decision in this case stating that there is no proper motivation to lock the size of text in *Templeman*. The Examiner agreed to review the rejection in view of the BPAI's decision.

III. Claim Rejections

A. Rejections over *Templeman* in view of *Nielsen* in further view of *Mosaic*

Claims 26, 27, 29, and 32-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Templeman* in view of *Nielsen* in further view of *Mosaic*.

Independent claims 26, 32-34, and 42 recite, in part, “enabling the size of selected text of the web page to be locked.” The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences issued a decision in this case (appeal no. 2005-0248) on June 1, 2005 stating:

[A]ny locking of the web page would defeat the whole purpose of the *Templeman* teaching to accommodate the differences between the various receiving platforms.

BPAP decision at 5. Since the current rejection maintains the use of *Templeman*, it is believed that the rejection is improper in light of the decision of the BPAP. Thus, it is believed that claims 26, 27, 29, and 32-45 are allowable over the combination of *Templeman*, *Nielsen*, and *Mosaic*.

B. Rejections over *Templeman* in view of *Nielsen* in further view of *Mosaic* in further view of *King*

Claims 30, 31, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Templeman* in view of *Nielsen* in further view of *Mosaic* in further view of *King*. Since the current rejection maintains the use of *Templeman*, it is believed that the rejection is improper in light of the decision of the BPAP. Thus, it is believed that claims 30, 31, 46, and 47 are allowable over the combination of *Templeman*, *Nielsen*, *Mosaic*, and *King*.

IV. Conclusion

Applicant believes that no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge deposit account 06-2380.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that the attorney can be helpful in resolving any remaining issues or can otherwise be helpful in expediting allowance of the present application.

Dated: February 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office via electronic filing.

Date of Transmission: February 13, 2007

By: Thomas L. Kelton
Thomas Kelton
Registration No.: 54,214
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784
(214) 855-7115
(214) 855-8200 (Fax)
Attorneys for Applicant